

2011 Attendance Area Committee  
Meeting #8  
August 30, 2011

Summary

The eighth meeting of the 2011 Attendance Area Committee (AAC) began at 7:13 PM. Joel Gallihue Manager, School Planning, opened the meeting.

Staff members in attendance:

Ken Roey, Executive Director, Facilities Planning and Management  
Joel Gallihue, Manager of School Planning  
Jennifer Bubenko, Planning Specialist

Committee members in attendance:

Frank Biro	Anne Santos
Kenny Kan	Marc Steingesser
Jean Parr	Thomas Tucker

Committee members not in attendance:

Kayline Anantua	Shannon Taitt
Chanelle Brawner	Gay Williams
Karen Rossbottom	

Handouts

Committee members received:

- Summary notes from the 8/16/11 AAC Meeting
- A letter from a citizen who does not want to be redistricted from Atholton ES
- A letter and map from a citizen who wants polygons 1259 to have the same school assignments as polygons 122 and 125.
- **AAC\_I plan reports:** As of 8/16/11, plan AAC\_I moves 2,348 students, approximately 10.5% of the countywide elementary school population. This plan was not completed, and is still a work-in-progress. Reports included the polygons moved, capacity utilization charts based on the FY12 capital budget, feeder reports, assessment summary charts and maps. Below is a list of the sending and receiving schools, with the numbers of students moved as of 8/16/11.

<b>As of 8/16/11, Plan AAC_I – Plan Summary</b>			
<b>Sending School</b>	<b>Receiving School</b>	<b>Number of students</b>	<b>Polygons Moved</b>
Atholton ES	Hammond ES	211	17, 18, 1017, 1018
Bollman Bridge ES	Gorman Crossing ES	122	20, 1020
Bollman Bridge ES	Guilford ES	53	27, 1027
Forest Ridge ES	Bollman Bridge ES	275	47, 3047, 4047
Forest Ridge ES	Gorman Crossing ES	66	267, 272, 1272

Fulton ES	Dayton Oaks ES	94	119, 194, 1119, 1194
Fulton ES	Pointers Run ES	442	112, 114, 117, 122, 125, 126, 256, 259, 296, 1114, 1115, 1117, 1125, 1256, 1259, 1296, 2112, 2114, 2115, 3115
Gorman ES	Fulton ES	332	3, 7, 297, 1003, 1007, 1297
Guilford ES	Atholton ES	108	15, 16, 1016
Guilford ES	Hammond ES	36	1015
Hammond ES	Clemens Crossing ES	57	270, 1011
Hammond ES	Fulton ES	199	8, 221, 1008, 1221, 1227, 2221
Laurel Woods ES	Forest Ridge ES	201	1, 121, 1001, 1121
Pointers Run ES	Clarksville ES	152	64, 129, 1064, 1129

### Group Discussion

Mr. Gallihue summarized the 2011 attendance area review process. The primary focus of this process has been to consider the need for redistricting from the southeast to the west in order to provide relief to overcrowded southeast schools and take advantage of available capacity in the western portion of the county.

We began our effort by identifying schools that were particularly over crowded. These included Atholton ES, Forest Ridge ES, Gorman Crossing ES and Laurel Woods ES. All four of these schools are projected to exceed 115% utilization in 2012. Only Forest Ridge ES appears to improve over time. The only new capacity planned for the region is the 173 seat addition to Gorman Crossing and that addition is not enough to contain the expected growth in the current attending area. Additions at Bollman Bridge ES and Hammond ES help those schools but do not offer enough capacity to provide relief to other schools in the region.

The Feasibility Study presents a plan which utilizes available capacity west of US 29. This general idea has been discussed for a number of years in previous Feasibility Documents. The plan in the Feasibility Study is the current staff recommendation, however staff has made it clear to the Board of Education and this committee that staff is open to different suggestions. Generally the staff plan improves utilization in the Southeast but the obvious weakness is that few of the schools are brought below 110% utilization, and remain outside the target utilization recognized by BOE policy. Laurel Woods ES is only briefly helped by the staff plan. After having done redistricting, if Laurel Woods ES grows as projected and if a capital project is not possible it will be difficult to go back and redistrict a second time.

The committee began with small redistricting exercises. Members worked in groups where they learned how to suggest changes and read the resulting reports. These plans exposed some ideas that may help but they were not comprehensive plans. After the group developed some experience working with a more confined horizon, they were able to make plan that demonstrated a key objective for the group. This was that the plan can be more extensive than the staff plan if the benefits of the plan last longer. This plan was labeled Plan F.

Subsequent to the development of Plan F two individual members scheduled time with staff to try some improvements to Plan F. These are Plans G and H. While these plans did not represent a consensus of the group, they introduced the idea of using some different schools that have capacity like Clarksville ES.

Finally the group decided to make a Plan I which uses some of the ideas that came up in Plans G and H as well as some of the earlier exercises.

**A plan comparison chart can be found below. Notes about additional discussion are below the chart.**

Elementary School Summary		Current	Feas. Study Plan	AAC_I	Assessment Criteria
Balance FARM %	(ES Average = 18%)	18.4%	18.6%	18.8%	Standard Deviation reduced by 25% or more = Strength; increased by 25% or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	StdDev	15.95	15.94	15.87	
			NEGLIGIBLE	NEGLIGIBLE	
Balance MSA Reading Pass Rate	(ES Average = 92%)	91.7%	91.6%	91.4%	Standard Deviation reduced by 25% or more = Strength; increased by 25% or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	StdDev	5.94	5.90	5.72	
			NEGLIGIBLE	NEGLIGIBLE	
Balance MSA Math Pass Rate	(ES Average = 93%)	92.5%	92.4%	92.3%	Standard Deviation reduced by 25% or more = Strength; increased by 25% or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	StdDev	5.73	5.72	5.69	
			NEGLIGIBLE	NEGLIGIBLE	
Consecutive Years Under 110%	# of Schools Strengthened	NA	4	5	Mean increased by 1.0 or more = Strength; reduced by 1.0 or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	# of Schools Weakened	NA	4	3	
	Mean	7.9	7.7	8.3	
			NEGLIGIBLE	NEGLIGIBLE	
Balanced 2012 Utilization	# of Schools Strengthened	NA	7	9	Standard Deviation reduced by 25% or more = Strength; increased by 25% or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	# of Schools Weakened	NA	2	1	
	StdDev	17.39	15.13	14.53	
			NEGLIGIBLE	NEGLIGIBLE	
Balanced 2022 Utilization	# of Schools Strengthened	NA	7	7	Standard Deviation reduced by 25% or more = Strength; increased by 25% or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	# of Schools Weakened	NA	3	2	
	StdDev	37.69	34.44	32.34	
			NEGLIGIBLE	NEGLIGIBLE	
Proximity to School	# of Schools Strengthened	NA	5	4	Mean reduced by 100 or more = Strength; increased by 100 or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	# of Schools Weakened	NA	5	8	
	Mean	5654	5688	5866	
	(smaller # = closer set of polygons)		NEGLIGIBLE	WEAKNESS	
Non-Contiguous Attendance Areas	Number of "Islands"	5	4	4	"After" count lower than "Before" = Strength; "After" higher = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
			STRENGTH	STRENGTH	
Transportation Costs	(ES Avg Rating = 0.00)	NA	-0.10	NOT YET TESTED	Mean increased = Strength; mean reduced = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
	(pos=savings; neg=cost)		WEAKNESS		
Students Moved	Number	NA	1157	2348	% of enrollment greater than 10% = High Movement, 5% to 10% = Moderate Movement, less than 5% = Low Movement
	% of Enrollment	NA	5.1%	10.4%	
			MODERATE MOVEMENT	MODERATE MOVEMENT	
Students moved too soon after last move	Number	NA	0	0	% of enrollment greater than 3% = High Movement, greater than 0% to 3% = Moderate Movement, 0% = No Movement
	% of Enrollment	NA	0.0%	0.0%	
			NO MOVEMENT	NO MOVEMENT	
Small ES-to-MS Feeds (under 15%)	# of Small Feeds	21	18	22	"After" count lower than "Before" = Strength; "After" higher = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
			STRENGTH	WEAKNESS	
Double Small Feeds	# of Double Small Feeds	3	3	3	"After" count lower than "Before" = Strength; "After" higher = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
			NEGLIGIBLE	NEGLIGIBLE	
Low Utilization (Under 90%) 2012-2023	Per-school Average Years	3.7	3.6	3.3	Mean reduced by 0.1 or more = Strength; increased by 0.1 or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
			STRENGTH	STRENGTH	
High Utilization (Over 110%) 2012-2023	Per-school Average Years	4.1	4.2	3.6	Mean reduced by 0.1 or more = Strength; increased by 0.1 or more = Weakness; otherwise Negligible
			NEGLIGIBLE	STRENGTH	

**The following was noted:**

- Low elementary to middle school feeds can be fixed by redistricting at either the elementary school or middle school level.
- The AAC makes a recommendation to the Superintendent.
- The Attendance Area document will include various plans that were considered.
- The AAC can endorse a specific plan and/or provide specific factors that he should take into consideration.
- Bus routing is complicated and routes are tiered. For example, a bus might run any combination of elementary, middle, high, special needs or pre-kindergarten routes.
- The group asked about open enrollment as a method of parental satisfaction, but not as a method of bringing capacity utilization within policy guidelines. Staff noted that there is a workgroup reviewing this topic and preparing a report for the BOE.
- Consider lengthier appointment periods for the AAC (i.e. 2 – 3 years).

**2011 AAC Concepts:**

- The AAC remained within the scope of elementary school redistricting in the southeast portion of the county.
  
- Students in the over-utilized eastern portion of the county must be redistricted westward to use the capacity in under-utilized schools.
  
- The AAC recommends moving more students to bring capacity utilization within policy guidelines of 90-110% for a longer period of time. The AAC developed plan AAC\_I with the intent of long term resolution to over- and under-capacity, but the plan has not been completed.
  
- In order to develop plan AAC\_I, the AAC had to take on some difficult tasks with the limited time available, like dividing large neighborhoods (i.e. like Maple Lawn), redistricting (and thus removing) walk areas, and potentially increase transportation costs, in order to optimize capacity utilization. Nothing was off the table to resolve capacity utilization.
  
- Developing plan AAC\_I was an opportunity to think with a countywide perspective, and some members' own neighborhoods were impacted by changes in the plan.
  
- The AAC considered the impact on the capital and operating budgets. Plan AAC\_I provides more options/flexibility in developing future capital projects because the Gorman Crossing ES addition could possibly be deferred to a later year. The AAC tried to determine if the addition could be removed from the capital budget, but their plans could only potentially defer the project.
  
- The AAC\_I plan and staff plan in the Feasibility Study removed a non-contiguous attendance area.
  
- The AAC did not consider resolution to small feeds for the AAC\_I plan. Middle school redistricting could consider resolving low feeds in later years.

- Neither plan addresses Swansfield. An example discussed in the group (plan H) was reviewed to address the overcapacity at Swansfield. Plan H provides options to use capacity at Clarksville to relieve Swansfield, but the exact moves could not be integrated with plan AAC\_I as it currently stands. Staff should look at the option to relieve Swansfield ES.

**Members of the AAC had several concerns, including the following:**

- Unknown future funds for operating/capital budgets
- Unknown affect on transportation costs (plan AAC\_I)
- Unfinished plans (neither plan is perceived to be complete)
- Swansfield ES overcrowding is not addressed.
- Unsure if walk areas are a valid assessment for a plan

**Homework**

AAC members to provide feedback about the AAC process to Ken Roey, an feel free to provide feedback to the BOE as well.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 PM.